REMARKS

Claims 1 to 29 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1 to 29 stand rejected as anticipated.

Claims 1 to 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,958,013, hereinafter referred to as "King." The Examiner stated in part:

> . . . generating a user interface infrastructure, on said first computer system, to receive graphic user interface events from said second computer system and to send remote graphic user interface commands to said second computer system (Column 8, lines 38-48; Column 10, line 49 - Column 11, line 8);

Column 8, lines 38 to 50 of King taught:

> The terminal emulation information includes a Java applet 332, which is stored on the server 130 at the host access resource location 230. The Java applet 332 is downloaded to the remote computer 110 to be processed under the Java environment 316 to establish and conduct a session between the remote computer 110 and the application 240 on the host computer 140. For example, processing of the downloaded Java applet 318 may cause the remote computer to establish a user interface for the application, as well as control communications between the remote computer 110 and the application 240 according to the protocol required by the application 240, e.g., a TN3270 protocol.

Thus, according to King, a Java applet is used on a remote computer "to establish and conduct a session between the remote computer 110 and the application 240 on the host computer 140. . . applet 318 may cause the remote computer to establish a user interface."

Col. 10, line 49 to Column 11, line 8 taught:

> The Presentation Space Object ps3270 of the illustrated embodiment maintains a virtual host display screen for a session. The behavior and characteristics of

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

> the presentation space may be based on terminal connection type and presentation space size session properties. The Presentation Space Object ps3270 holds formatted screen data and attributes and provides methods for extracting and entering information in the presentation space. External methods for this object may include getting and setting presentation space content, getting and setting field content, getting field attributes, navigating fields, accepting keyboard, function key and other user inputs, and the like. These external methods may be used by the Data Stream Object ds3270, as well as by other applications resident at the remote computer 110, to assemble data streams for communication to the application 240.
>
> The Data Stream Object ds3270 of the illustrated embodiment parses and assembles host data streams. Methods for this object may include sending and receiving host application format data streams. For example, the Transport Object tn3270 may use a "receive data" method of the Data Stream Object ds3270 to pass a host data stream from the application 240 onto the Presentation Space Object ps3270. Similarly, the Presentation Space Object ps3270 may use a "send data" method of the Data Stream Object ds3270 to request assembly of a data stream for transmission to the host application 240 via the Transport Object tn3270.

Thus, the rejection appears to equate "a user interface," with "a user interface infrastructure," which are different, and establishes remote computer 110 of King as equivalent to the first computer system recited in Claim 1. This is confirmed by the second citation to King, because Fig. 5 of King shows that ps3270 and ds3270 are on remote computer 110.

Applicants note that to support an anticipation rejection, the MPEP requires:

> **TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM**
>
> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.". . . "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim."

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

MPEP § 2131, Eighth Ed., Rev. 2, p. 2100-73, (May 2004).

The rejection demonstrates that King fails to teach exactly what is claimed. Claim 1 recites in part:

> a user interface infrastructure, on said first computer system, to receive graphic user interface events from said second computer system and to send remote graphic user interface commands to said second computer system

The second computer system in King is mainframe computer 140. The Examiner has failed to cite any teaching that the interface on the remote computer 110 of King receives graphic user interface events from mainframe computer 140 of King. King fails to teach "The identical invention . . . as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim," at several levels. Hence, according to the MPEP, King fails to anticipate Claim 1. If the Examiner continues the rejection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to cite with particularly what the Examiner considers to be the first computer, the second computer, the graphic user interface infrastructure, graphic user interface events, and remote graphic user interface commands with respect to the first and second computers as recited in Claim 1. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2 to 6 depend from Claim 1 and so distinguish over King for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 2 to 6.

In the rejection of Claim 7, the examiner cited to methods on remote system 110 that provide information to the Presentation Space Object as teaching exactly "receiving a remote input action command from a runtime environment component service via said communication network." The cited commands do not come over a communications network, but are

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

shown in Fig. 5 as being associated with remote system 110. Again, remote system 110, illustrated in Fig. 5, of King is a single system, but yet the rejection appears to equate this single system to the first and second systems recited in Claim 7.

Similarly, processes 510, 520, and 530 are shown as being in remote computer system 110. Nowhere has the Examiner cited "a lightweight component corresponding to said runtime component service" in one computer system and the runtime environment component service in another computer system as recited in Claim 7. In addition, the above comments with respect to Claim 1 are also directly applicable to Claim 7. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 7.

Claims 8 to 13 depend from Claim 7 and so distinguish over King for at least the same reasons as Claim 7. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 8 to 13.

With respect to the anticipation rejection of Claim 14, the Examiner quoted the claim and cited to Column 12, lines 10 to 26 of King, and to Column 10, lines 49 to 53 that were quoted above.

King, Col. 12, lines 10 to 26 taught:

> Referring now to FIG. 6, to initiate a session (Block 600), a user at the remote computer opens a URL to initiate a download of a Java applet and processing of the downloaded applet (Block 605). The processing of the applet instantiates a Session Object, which in turn instantiates host access processing objects including a Transport Object, Data Stream Object and Presentation Space Object (Block 610). The Transport Object opens a socket connection to a 3270 server port (Block 615), setting up a continuous read loop to the host computer (Block 620), performing 3270 negotiation (Block 625), and passing 3270 data streams to the Data Stream Object (Block 630). The 3270 data streams may then be parsed (Block 635), the data entered in a buffer maintained by the Presentation Space Object (Block 640), and field

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

> structures constructed (Block 645). A user interface is then updated at the end of the data stream (Block 650), e.g., a data input/output screen is "painted."

The objects described here are shown in Fig. 5 are being created on remote computer system 110 of King. Similarly, the Presentation Space Object described at Column 10, lines 49 to 53 is shown as being on remote computer system 110.

Claim 14 recites an operation on a computer system and "issuing an instruction to create an instance of a remote frame window on said user device." Processes on a single computer system such as those cited by the Examiner in King fail to teach receiving a command from a component executing on a user device, and issuing the instruction for the user device as just quoted from the Claim 14. Claim 14 clearly distinguishes between the user device and the computer system, and what is intended for each of the devices. Accordingly, King fails to meet the requirements of the MPEP as quoted above as interpreted by the Examiner. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 14.

Claims 15 to 21 depend from Claim 14 and so distinguish over King for at least the same reasons as Claim 14. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 15 to 21.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 22. Again, the processes and methods cited are on computer 110 of King. The Examiner has failed to cite any teaching of "generates corresponding user interface events to said another computer for processing by said runtime environment component." If the Examiner continues the rejection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to cite with specificity what the Examiner considers being the "another computer" and what the Examiner considers the runtime environment component on that another computer to be.

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 22.

Claim 23 depends from Claim 22 and so distinguishes over King for at least the same reasons as Claim 22. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 23.

The Examiner cited King, Col. 10, lines 49 to 54 that were quoted above in the anticipation rejection of Claim 24. Claim 24 recites a computer program product that includes a specific class that in turn includes two specific interfaces. The cited section of King does mention an object, which might be assumed to be an instantiation of a class. However, neither the specific class nor the specific interfaces are described. In fact, no classes or interfaces are described. Referring to the above quotation from the MPEP, the Examiner has failed to make the showing required by the MPEP to support an anticipation rejection. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 24.

Claims 25 to 27 depend from Claim 24 and so distinguish over King for at least the same reasons as Claim 24. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 25 to 27.

Claim 28 includes limitations equivalent to those of Claim 1 and so the above remarks concerning Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 28.

Claim 29 includes limitations equivalent to those of Claim 7 and so the above remarks concerning Claim 7 are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 29.

Claims 1 to 29 remain in the application. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888

relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on **October 21, 2004**.

Attorney for Applicant(s)

October 21, 2004
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899
Tel.: (831) 655-0880

GUNNISON, McKAY & HODGSON, L.L.P.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940
(831) 655-0880
Fax (831) 655-0888